



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,113	07/03/2003	Huican Zhu	60963-0007-US	7671

24341 7590 03/16/2007
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP.
2 PALO ALTO SQUARE
3000 EL CAMINO REAL
PALO ALTO, CA 94306

EXAMINER

BASHORE, WILLIAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/614,113

Applicant(s)

ZHU ET AL.

Examiner

William L. Bashore

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 42-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-15 and 42-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 1/8/2007, to the original application filed 7/3/2003. IDS filed 1/7/2005.
2. Claims 1-15, 42-47 pending. Claims 16-41 have been canceled, and claims 42-47 have been added by Applicant. Claims 1, 42 are independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-15, 42-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al. (hereinafter Bates), U.S. Patent No. 6,404,446 issued June 2002, in view of Dolan et al. (hereinafter Dolan), U.S. Patent No. 5,801,702 issued September 1998.**

In regard to independent claim 1, Bates teaches a graphic display of linked records (i.e. Web pages etc.) (Bates Abstract, Figure 1, column 6 lines 43-50).

Bates teaches a plurality of mapped link records, said records associated with source and target identifiers (Web pages or URLs) (Bates column 6 lines 28-49, Figures 1-2, 4).

Bates teaches (in at least Figures 1, 2) that said link record map is a sorted map, since each record is displayed in a hierarchical order (source to target traversal, etc.), therefore said records are sorted at least in part on their respective target identifiers.

It is also noted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for at least one record link (i.e. URL) in Bates (Figures 1, 2) to contain an outbound link, since each record is connected accordingly, and it was typical for a Web page to contain outbound link(s), facilitating surfing of the World Wide Web.

Although Bates teaches a map registry (a form of list, i.e. Windows registry, etc.) (Bates column 9 lines 10-14), Bates does not specifically teach said registry as containing a log of records, including source and target records. However, Dolan teaches presentation of a link hierarchy, including a navigation file comprising link records (Dolan Figure 7, column 11 lines 43-55). Dolan teaches in Figure 7 a record comprising at least parent and child pointers to associated record (URLs). Please also note that Dolan's Figure 2, and Figures 8A-8C are associated with Dolan's link record file (log) of Figure 7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Dolan to Bates registry, providing Bates the benefit of extra record information for use in a map display (see also Bates column 25 lines 20-35).

In regard to dependent claim 2, Bates does not specifically teach annotations. However Dolan teaches a record list comprising "title", and "author", said title reflective of a description of the subject item intended to inform the user accordingly (an annotation) (Dolan Figure 7, column 12 lines 10-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Dolan to Bates, providing Bates the benefit of extra record information for descriptive display.

In regard to dependent claims 3, 4, Bates does not specifically teach annotations. However Dolan teaches a record list comprising "title", and "author", said title reflective of a description of the subject item intended to inform the user accordingly (an annotation) (Dolan Figure 7, column 12 lines 10-18). It is noted that Dolan teaches a link record for each link (outbound, etc.). Additionally, Figure 7 also describes a list of attributes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Dolan to Bates, providing Bates the benefit of extra record information for descriptive display.

In regard to dependent claim 5, Bates does not specifically teach a text passage determined from a predetermined distance of an anchor tag. However Dolan teaches various text passages (titles) next to anchor tags (Dolan Figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Dolan's titles to Bates, providing Bates's URL display (i.e. Bates Figure 1 "http://ibm.com") extra displayed descriptive information.

In regard to dependent claims 6, 7, although Bates does not forcefully disclose "layering", Bates does teach that a presented link map is a dynamic procedure, whereby node elements are automatically added as new links are taken, etc. (Bates column 7 lines 2-11), providing reasonable suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that a form of layering is occurring (new links are layered and merged onto the existing map accordingly), providing the benefit of a dynamic surfing history (see also Bates column 27 lines 5-18).

In regard to dependent claim 8, claim 8 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale (please see the rejection of claim 1).

In regard to dependent claims 9, 10, although Bates does not forcefully disclose "layering", Bates does teach that a presented link map is a dynamic procedure, whereby node elements are automatically added as new links are taken, etc. (Bates column 7 lines 2-11), providing reasonable suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that a form of layering is occurring (new links are layered and merged onto the existing map accordingly), providing the benefit of a dynamic surfing history (see also Bates column 27 lines 5-18).

In regard to dependent claims 11, 12, claims 11, 12 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Bates teaches deletion of nodes as deemed necessary (Bates column 27 lines 1-5). It was well established at the time of the invention for the skilled artisan to apply “house cleaning” to lists of items, deleting items (URL records) which are redundant, no longer valid, etc., in order to save space.

Although Bates does not forcefully disclose “layering” or “merging”, Bates does teach that a presented link map is a dynamic procedure, whereby node elements are automatically added as new links are taken, etc. (Bates column 7 lines 2-11), providing reasonable suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that a form of layering is occurring (new links are layered and merged onto the existing map accordingly), providing the benefit of a dynamic surfing history (see also Bates column 27 lines 5-18).

In regard to dependent claim 13, Bates teaches deletion of nodes as deemed necessary (Bates column 27 lines 1-5). It was well established at the time of the invention for the skilled artisan to apply “house cleaning” to lists of items, deleting items (URL records) which are redundant, no longer valid, etc., in order to save space. As Bates updates a link map pursuant to record deletion, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret deletion as a link (Bates link) as broken, therefore the source identifier would not be referenced.

In regard to dependent claim 14, Bates teaches the Internet (Bates column 6 lines 39-50).

In regard to dependent claim 15, claim 15 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Bates teaches the Internet (Bates column 6 lines 39-50), typically comprising a plurality of interconnected (distinct) computer system hosts.

Bates teaches two addresses reflective of information about each host: “http:\\ibm.com” and “http://www.uspto.gov” (Bates Figure 1, also column 25 lines 20-35).

In regard to independent claim 42, claim 42 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Bates does not specifically teach annotations. However Dolan teaches a record list comprising “title”, and “author”, said title reflective of a description of the subject item intended to inform the user accordingly (an annotation) (Dolan Figure 7, column 12 lines 10-18). It is noted that Dolan teaches a link record for each link (outbound, etc.), which is a form of index. Additionally, Figure 7 also describes a list of attributes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Dolan to Bates, providing Bates the benefit of extra record information for descriptive display.

In regard to dependent claims 43, 44, 46, Bates does not specifically teach annotations. However Dolan teaches a record list comprising “title”, and “author”, said title reflective of a description of the subject item intended to inform the user accordingly (an annotation) (Dolan Figure 7, column 12 lines 10-18). It is noted that Dolan teaches a link record for each link (outbound, etc.). Additionally, it is noted that either “title” or “author” are subsets of the total text in an anchor record. Additionally, Figure 7 also describes a list of attributes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Dolan to Bates, providing Bates the benefit of extra record information for descriptive display.

In regard to dependent claims 45, Bates teaches search criteria (Bates Abstract – near bottom). Bates does not specifically extent its searching to a document index. However, Dolan teaches querying a navigation graph manager via at least a URN, said URN part of Dolan’s index file (see Dolan column 8 lines 55-64, Figure 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Dolan to Bates, providing Bates the benefit of index searching for more accurate search results.

In regard to dependent claim 47, Bates does not specifically teach a text passage determined from a predetermined distance of an anchor tag. However Dolan teaches various text passages (titles) next to anchor tags (Dolan Figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Dolan's titles to Bates, providing Bates's URL display (i.e. Bates Figure 1 "http://ibm.com") extra displayed descriptive information.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 1/8/2007 have been fully and carefully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the cited references do not teach Applicant's claimed limitations, as currently claimed. The examiner respectfully disagrees. At least Bates Figures 1 and 2 shows a map, which is a link map showing linked URLs sorted accordingly. Dolan also shows a similar link map (Dolan Figure 2, etc.). Dolan's link map relies upon its link manager for holding link information (i.e. an index) for each record (Dolan at least Figure 7), and also relies upon this index to provide information for its link map display. Figure 7 of Dolan shows various text information, such as I Version, URN, Title, author, etc. This index also shows parent, children, and peer pointers, which are reflective of linked Web pages accordingly (see Dolan column 14 lines 58-67). In addition, placing items in a hierarchical tree is a form of sorting items accordingly.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this


Art Unit: 2176

final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William L. Bashore whose telephone number is (571) 272-4088. The examiner can normally be reached on 11:30am - 8:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

March 14, 2007